

July 24, 1967

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I am reading Photographie Whitewash; it is no wonder the NYTimes treats your books as news. You have convinced me that the Z film probably ran 24 fps and that ~~does~~ mean two assassins. Also I believe that you are probably right that there were two almost simultaneous shots to the head. That is confirmed by Agent Hickey's statement in Vol 18 that he saw one bullet pass through the hair just before the massive wound occurred. I want to suggest that if the occiput or hairline wound was far enough to the left it might have exited above the right ear in a small wound (the doctors said a bullet could pass through the head and not create a massive defect) and this smaller exit wound might have then been obliterated by a direct hit above the ear that caused the massive defect. It could still (the occiput wound) have been on the right side of the head but more toward the middle. On the other hand Mrs. Kennedy mentioned turning and seeing a small piece of his skull. This could mean there was a left temple wound. It is inexcusable that the Commission allowed her testimony, not only to be deleted in places, but that no effort was made to clear it up. It was deliberately left in its confused state.

If Kennedy was hit at 227 and spun left, as the Z film shows, and Connally was hit at 234 and spun right, as the film shows and as Mrs. Connally confirms, the chances are that there must have been a gunman somewhere to the left rear of Connally. Given his position in the seat this is possible; for though he had started to turn back left his body was still primarily in the right-turn position. His head had followed his thought to turn back left but his body had only partially followed the thought for the elevation of his shoulder just prior to 234 indicates that he is still primarily in a right turn position. Also if his ~~right~~ wrist was struck by the same bullet, it must have been, as it appears to be, not so much in front of him as between the chest and the right side of the ear. It appears to be shoved nearer the right side of the ear in 234, which would be compatible with a bullet fired from the left rear.

And I now agree that there was a crossfire, a very neat one, involving not only the position off the right trunk but the position off the left trunk also, which I had long ago thought might be possible. I urge you to get all the hands located in the Altgens film. It is almost impossible. Both gunmen were firing forward.

I agree that there is no evidence against Johnson; but there is that that might be considered circumstantial evidence in a courtroom. Johnson would be in the position of a spouse whose mate has died with benefit to him and there is a suspicion of a hired killer. His defense would be that he was also under attack. His associate (youngblood) acknowledged that he threw himself over the defendant to protect him. Then it turns out that no such incident took place. Senator Yarborough (and Dave Powers) apparently have said that Youngblood never left the front seat; and the Altgens film right in the middle of the assassination period shows him still in the front seat. Yet he received a medal or citation and appeared with the President on national TV to be praised for an act which we now find out may never have occurred. In a courtroom, in a case based on circumstantial evidence, it could go very hard for a defendant caught out in such a whopper.

There is also the fact that Henry Wade testified that it was the "White House" who called off the strong Dallas movement to file on Oswald for murder with conspiracy. Here the "White House" appears to be the Johnson party rather than the Kennedy party who was actually in the White House. Indications are that it was Cliff Carter talking to Barefoot Sanders who called off the conspiracy charge. Once Oswald had been arrested and it became necessary to kill him (for whatever reason, guilt or innocence) then it became obvious to the assassins that there had to be no conspiracy quite simply for the fact that whoever agreed to kill Oswald would have to be assured that he would be treated not as a conspirator but as a hero. He wouldn't have been persuaded to do it otherwise. It is quite a coincidence then that just when it became necessary to file on Oswald for murder alone the order to do so came from the "White House".

There is also the fact that de Mohrenschildt was going to Houston to see John Mecom and one of the Brown brothers: none of which was cleared up in testimony. It was glossed over until it is difficult to find out just who he was going to see which means counsel wanted to keep it out of the record. There is also the whitewash on deM., a second rate spy if there ever was one: and one with a connection to strong supporters of Johnson.

This is getting very close to solid circumstantial evidence. So Johnson stays on the list. This is different from accusing the man: but he has left it up to the citizens of the country to solve the crime as best they can. Until it is solved or he is eliminated as a suspect by solid evidence then he ought to be on the list of any reasonable person, in my opinion.

However, one could consider that it is possible that unknown to Johnson the aim of the assassination was to put him in office. In that case, my contention that an assassin any place in Dealey Plaza, in a fixed position, would have had Johnson just 5 seconds off his gunsights still holds. This could still shed light on the mechanics of the assassination: for what kind of assassins were these who would take such a chance - with Johnson so close in time to an assassins bullet - they might easily have wiped out the executive branch of the government and delivered it into the hands of Rep. McCormack. Who would immediately have become a captive of the Kennedy party. What good would that do the assassins? Or must we assume that this was purely a spite killing? Remember how long it was in the planning. It took months just to set up Oswald as a fall guy. A killing for hatred alone is usually not that well organized. For unless this was a spite killing, the assassins took a chance on killing Johnson, who under our system had to figure in the plans of any assassins who wanted more out of the assassination than to kill Kennedy.

So I still think that whether or not Johnson was in on the plot, if the assassins did not work for spite alone, then they would not have put Johnson in such danger as he obviously was if there was any stationary gunman any place in Dealey Plaza that day. You can conceive it this way: three dogs are running down the road one behind the other. The first dog you want to shoot, the second dog you don't know, and the third dog is yours. The only thing that could make you take a chance on killing your dog is if the first dog is a mad dog and must be stopped though the sky falls. Was Kennedy shot down on the street for a mad dog, or did the

assassins have something else in mind? Was the assassination a bridge or not? We can tell from its aftermath that it probably was. Under our system, any presidential assassins are going to think long and hard about the vice president: the CIA in particular knows that to push its policies it has to count on the man in the White House. Were they, or any like minded body going to take a chance on plunging the government into the hands of Rep. McCormack? Whom the Kennedys could have influenced so strongly?

I am not arguing from evidence now, of course, but from reason, for in this area we have no evidence.

I have read in Esquire of the long hunt for Vaganov about which I knew nothing. And I don't know how accurate the article is. But one thing stands out bright and clear to me: I at least have offered a complete and total explanation of what could have happened in Dealey Plaza that day: one that explains almost all the stubborn odd little things that no one wants to consider at all, such as, for instance, why people smelled gunpowder at street level and why it clung to the Johnson car all the way to the hospital. How the entry wounds could have been below the exit wounds; why Bennett didn't hear the shot he saw strike; why nobody else heard the shot that hit Connally. I have described the perfect crossfire - one that could have caused the headsnap. Yet these critics who will track a jacket and a man halfway across the country won't bother to find out where a couple of hands were in the Altgens photograph. And why not? Because I guess they all think it too unlikely that anyone would have that much gall. But the men I have in mind, in bravado and gall, are but a hairsbreadth removed from the Hell's Angels in psychological make up. And besides: if Johnson, or anyone else in a position of power, did pull off this assassination, then all they had to do was get Kennedy. Once Johnson was in office they had no worries. Anything could be obfuscated and covered up or plain denied - as it was.

As for the headsnap. I can explain that, too, on the basis of my theory. A bullet travelling from the right rear of the limosine could have caused the head to snap backward just as when you hit the right edge of a rock or can it will frequently skip backward: only the part broken off - in this case the right edge of the skull, would fly forward. The doctors discussed tangential wounds and seemed to think this might be a possibility in the case of the massive defect in the head. A tangential wound to the right skull fired from the right rear could snap the head back and left. Just like a can when you hit it on the right rim. I hit a paper cup with my left tire on the way to work this morning, right at the rim, didn't smash it, it reeled off backwards and leftward. The head is loose and mobile like a ball. You know how a foul ball can snap off in any direction. A foul ball is one hit right on the edge. It can and frequently does snap back or left of the batter.

On the other hand one bullet fired from the left rear and one from the right rear and striking almost simultaneously could make the head behave queerly, especially if the one from the right rear struck forward of the a previous one ~~xxxxx~~ from the left rear. It would stop the forward movement of the head and snap it left; and in the case of a tangential wound, backward.

My theory also explains Mrs. Kennedy's trip over the right trunk of the car. There are three explanations given for that. She was going for a piece of skull, she was going for help, she was trying to get out of the car and save herself. None is reasonable if examined. No single piece of that skull was big enough to go after. If the whole thing had been blown off in one piece it would not have been big enough to go after and it wasn't. It came off in a thousand particles, the biggest probably invisible, flying so fast past her eyes. She was not going for help for the simple fact that she would have yelled at Kellerman or looked directly back at the follow up car. She didn't even see Hill coming up until he was there. And the photo in the Warren Report issue of life shows her looking directly over the right trunk of the car, not at all back at the follow up car where the agents were. And she was not trying to save herself since she put her self in the utmost danger by spreadeagling herself over the trunk of the car. If she had been trying to save herself she would have ducked or gone out the left door. Her main objective would have been to save her head since she had just seen the President's blown off and since the rest of her body was pretty well shielded by the car and the President's body. She would simply have tried to get her head down - not crawled out over the trunk of the car where she made a perfect target.

For whatever reason she went over the trunk of the car she put her life in great danger. It was worth the risk of her life. She was going instinctively for a murderer - toward the direction of the shots that killed her husband. Later probably even Bobby didn't believe her. She couldn't find anything in the evidence to support her. She probably came later to feel ashamed and wrong. So she "forgot" why she vaulted over that trunk in the half second after the fatal bullet struck. She "remembered" that the window was ~~down~~ ^{up} behind Kellerman so that his talking about what she had said wasn't so. (The window was ~~down~~ probably for in one picture Connally's hand seems to be through it.) She said a lot; and she obviously doesn't want to "remember" what it was. And she didn't want Kellerman to remember either so in her testimony she rolled up that window and cut him off.

And that's why, as you proved the Commission, had nine more frames it didn't publish. That trip over the right trunk of the car is one of the strangest and most striking things that happened that day. It had some meaning. And the fact that the suppressed nine frames weren't published when the Commission had them indicates most strongly that they revealed something. What they revealed was that she was going for something off the right trunk of the car that wasn't help or a piece of skull or safety. That's when the man broke and rode up the slope; the one Manchester found out about but gave Haygood's name and ride to.

Also it is the precisely the left side of missing frames 208-212 which reveals something. For Z210 was published but for the right side and what could have happened in Z208 and 209 and Z211 and Z212 that wouldn't show in the one-twenty-fourth of a second of Z210? And what could have happened in the left side but that a hand moved, a body moved forward, suddenly - a body that it is safe to show in the bottom of 212 for the fact that it then disappears from the film forever. Just like this man, closest of all witnesses to the President, as the Altgens film photo show, disappears

from the case forever. Why?

That's also why the Moorman photo was so light. All you have to do to let light into a Polaroid is hold it without painting it for a few hours which is precisely what the Sheriff's office did. The missing Moorman picture showed the "lead" motorcycle escort. Maybe it wasn't the lead escort after all. Certainly the lightest part of the Moorman photo that moved on the wires is the part that shows the escort, precisely the two that could have delivered the perfect crossfire. And that's the photo Jack Ruby left face up, or prominently displayed in his room: so much as to say, better treat me right, I know. And it was the motorcycle escort which was close to Ruby: Wes Hardee said so. A Dallas juvenile officer who had once been on the motorcycle escort says so. Harry Olsen had a friend on the escort for whom he stood in in Oak Cliff that day guarding an old woman's house.

You are interested in Hugh Betzner's photos. What about what Betzner said, that he thought he saw a nickelplated revolver in the hands of someone in the ~~motorcade~~ motorcade that day. That is dropped like a hot rock. That isn't a regulation weapon. It could look like chrome or piping though. And if Betzner noticed that, he could very well have taken a picture of it for that it is precisely what he was doing: taking pictures.

The best way to get a president is to corrupt his bodyguard. And the safest way is to corrupt a temporary bodyguard, one without the esprit de corps of the permanent bodyguard. And what bodyguard would be easier to corrupt than that of a foreign country like Texas? And as a matter of fact how did this bodyguard behave? It's duty was to guard the President. It had mobile power. It could have arrived en masse at the sides of the ~~limosine~~ limosine in a second: what did it do? It never did arrive at the sides of the limosine. It stayed well back until after the President's head blew off. Then two of the guard fell away and ran up the knoll. Not only that but the Nix and Muchmore frames seem to show that the motorcycle escort actually fell back temporarily. At the very least it did not do its simple duty, which it could have done in a second given the acceleration of a motorcycle: rush to the sides of the car. Hill had time to reach the end of the limosine before the fatal shot was fired, on foot. Yet the motorcycle escort never did reach the side of the car, and then only to pass it when it was all over. Yet the Altgens photograph shows that at least two of those officers have their eyes fastened on the President whereas the secret service agents don't even know what is going on. And then three members of that escort lie about their position: saying they are in front of the limosine, until the production of pictures proves they were behind. If the Dallas police had guilty knowledge - and that seems evident - if they were in on the assassination, if a faction of them were in on it, why is it not plausible to assume that the body guard could have been in on it too?

I do feel like Cassandra.

Sincerely,

Beverly Brunson
Beverly Brunson

Box 296

Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713.

*and the fourth side up
the knoll: variables forever.*